

GOVERNOR'S EMERGENCY OPERATIONS EXECUTIVE COUNCIL (GEOEC)



STATE STRATEGY FOR EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AND HOMELAND SECURITY

MARCH 2008

Table of Contents

Executive Summary.....	2
Vision & Purpose Statement.....	4
Chapter 1: Introduction.....	5
Chapter 2: Purpose and Scope.....	7
Chapter 3: Project Governance.....	8
Chapter 4: Background and Organization Description.....	9
Chapter 5: Strategic Focus Areas.....	12
Chapter 6: Enterprise-Wide Issues.....	13
1. Funding Issues & Coordination.....	14
2. Continuity of Operations / Continuity of Government (COOP/COG).....	17
3. Emergency Management.....	19
4. Community Readiness.....	21
5. Information Sharing.....	23
6. Interoperable Communications.....	28
7. Legislative Coordination.....	30
8. Pandemic Influenza Planning.....	31
9. Training & Exercises.....	33
10. Workforce Issues.....	35
11. Capabilities Identification and Assessment.....	37
12. Cyber Systems, Technology and Security Coordination.....	39
13. Coordination with Local, Regional and Federal Plans & Programs.....	41
Chapter 7: Next Steps & Closing Comments.....	42

Executive Summary

California has long been a leader in disaster preparedness and emergency management. Since 1917, some type of emergency organization has existed in California to respond to emergencies such as fires, floods and earthquakes. Yet the threat to California continues to evolve to include new dangers such as another outbreak of pandemic influenza or animal-borne diseases and terrorism attacks. As a result, California has recognized that disaster preparedness and emergency management is a cross-discipline effort and requires the collaboration and coordination of all State government entities.

Governor Schwarzenegger has made public safety a top priority. He has directed numerous State initiatives to improve the State's preparedness and coordination. One such initiative was undertaken in April 2006, when Governor Schwarzenegger signed *Executive Order S-04-06*. The order directs the Director of the Office of Emergency Services (OES) and the Director of the Office of Homeland Security (OHS) to convene a coordinating body for emergency management and homeland security activities across California State government.

As a result of this EO, the Directors of OHS and OES created the Governor's Emergency Operations Executive Council (GEOEC). The GEOEC is a forum for State agencies and departments to coordinate planning, fiscal, legislative, and all other enterprise-wide issues to support the most efficient use of State resources and to achieve the greatest number of public policy goals.

The *State Strategy for Emergency Management and Homeland Security* was developed in order to articulate the GEOEC's strategic approach to these focus areas. The *State Strategy* builds upon previous efforts to coordinate statewide emergency preparedness activities. The *State Strategy* integrates key concepts and strategic plans identified in *the California State Emergency Plan, the California Homeland Security Strategy, the California Pandemic Influenza Preparedness and Response Plan* and other statewide and agency and department-specific plans. It enhances, compliments, and coordinates the numerous committees and strategies that are in place to deal with the wide variety of subcomponent issues addressed by agencies and departments in their individual emergency preparedness duties. The GEOEC recognizes the need for the development of one common vision for California to support, link and coordinate all the State's planning activities in emergency management and homeland security.

The *State Strategy for Emergency Management and Homeland Security* identifies thirteen key enterprise-wide issues that are central to the State's mission to enhance California's emergency preparedness.

Enterprise-wide issues include:

1. Funding Issues & Coordination
2. Continuity of Operations / Continuity of Government (COOP/COG)
3. Emergency Management
4. Community Readiness

5. Information Sharing
6. Interoperable Communications
7. Legislative Coordination
8. Pandemic Influenza Planning
9. Training & Exercises
10. Workforce Issues
11. Capabilities Identification and Assessment
12. Cyber Systems, Technology and Security Coordination
13. Coordination with Local, Regional and Federal Plans & Programs

These focus areas cannot be the responsibility of one single entity, but require coordination among all or the majority of all State agencies and departments. The *State Strategy* outlines goals and objectives to enhance capabilities and provides a process to improve statewide coordination in these areas.

Vision Statement

State agencies and departments operate with fully coordinated, resilient, and cutting edge emergency management and homeland security programs in order to safeguard Californians and our way of life.

Purpose Statement

The *State Strategy for Emergency Management and Homeland Security*, developed and overseen by the Governor's Emergency Operations Executive Council (GEOEC), serves as a State-level framework integrating key initiatives and programs for emergency management and homeland security to:

- Coordinate overarching issues across State agencies;
- Maximize State resources and efforts;
- Enhance, complement and incorporate statewide and agency/department-specific strategies and processes currently in place;
- Allow for education, dialogue and coordination with key stakeholders.

Through the collective efforts of all California state agencies and departments responsible for implementing this strategy, we can enhance our ability to more effectively prevent, prepare for, mitigate, respond to and recover from natural and manmade disasters in California.

Chapter 1

Introduction

People throughout the world have enjoyed the beauty of California, a natural wonderland that includes majestic mountain ranges, foggy coastlines, sandy white beaches, scenic deserts, an abundant network of lakes, rivers and levies and the fertile central valley all within 160,000 square miles.

California faces the challenges of many nations, let alone states, with diverse terrain shaped by nature's fury and human activity. The sheer size of our State combined with a population of 36 million, estimated to reach 60 million by 2050, presents significant responsibilities to managing the multitude of catastrophic exposures to our state. This, in combination with California serving as one of the largest economies in the world, creates additional responsibilities on our ability to successfully prepare for, respond to and recover from catastrophic events.

Within the past 50 years, California has seen immense growth, an almost unquenchable thirst for resources and a strong economy that has allowed many businesses to flourish and grow. However, for all these successes, California is still facing growing risks created by our own growth and expansion.

The rate of urbanization has been significant, specifically in the development of catastrophe-prone areas. The value of these properties has also increased which results in each event being more costly than the last. Other critical factors and risk exposures include our aging infrastructure (i.e., roads, bridges, levees, buildings and schools) and the long-term effects of climate change. Additionally, California's geographic, economic, cultural, ethnic and linguistic diversity pose significant challenges to enhance community preparedness and provide emergency response during and after an event.

In recognition and response to these realities, Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger has made public safety in California a top priority. The Governor continues to enhance the State's emergency preparedness capabilities and improve Statewide coordination. In an effort to ensure California has the most coordinated emergency preparedness program possible, Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger signed Executive Order S-04-06. This order directed the Director of the Office of Emergency Services (OES) and the Director of the Office of Homeland Security (OHS) to convene the Governor's Emergency Operations Executive Council (GEOEC), a coordinating body for emergency management and homeland security activities across California State government. This council consists of State agencies and departments which have a key role in the emergency preparedness and homeland security mission and tasked to:

- a) assess and provide necessary information to the Governor, Legislature, local agencies, and the public on pending emergency conditions that threaten public health and safety;
- b) develop a consolidated set of budget, legislative, and administrative actions, along with identification of additional federal resources required to improve state prevention and response capabilities to deal with pending threats to public health and

- safety; and,
- c) assist in the management of emergency preparedness, response, recovery, & mitigation efforts.

The GEOEC developed the *State Strategy for Emergency Management and Homeland Security* to communicate the State's approach to addressing these mission areas and develop a process to enhance coordination.

Chapter 2

Purpose and Scope

The *State Strategy for Emergency Management and Homeland Security* addresses how California State government identifies and coordinates major challenges in its mission to enhance disaster prevention, preparedness, response, recovery and mitigation. The *State Strategy* facilitates the coordination and integration of agency and departmental activities and initiatives in emergency management and homeland security. The *State Strategy* identifies enterprise-wide issues, reviews key agency and discipline-specific strategies and plans, and sets goals for the State as a whole. It further articulates prioritization processes for budget and legislative proposals. The *State Strategy* is designed to inform key stakeholders, including elected officials and the public, about California's emergency management and homeland security program and provides a framework for statewide coordination. It provides an approach to coordinating overarching issues across State agencies, and a method for maximizing State resources and efforts in these areas.

The *State Strategy* is closely coordinated and incorporates other strategic plans. It identifies and sets goals for Statewide issues, goals and objectives identified in *the California State Emergency Plan*, *the California Homeland Security Strategy*, *the California Pandemic Influenza Preparedness and Response Plan* and other Statewide and agency/department-specific plans. The *State Strategy* does not supersede or replace existing plans or strategies, but instead integrates key initiatives and goals in one single document, providing a overarching framework for collaboration across State government in emergency management and homeland security.

The *State Strategy* has been vetted through the GEOEC process to ensure all State agencies and departments have had the opportunity to provide input. The *State Strategy* will be refined and updated each year by the GEOEC to reflect California's evolving approach to prevent, prepare for, respond to, and recover from all hazards. Success will be measured by achievement of goals and objectives adopted by the GEOEC.

Chapter 3

Project Governance

In any major project, core values and guiding principles as defined by stakeholders serve as foundational elements driving the project. Core values are bedrock perspectives projected by the agencies and departments participating in the project. The values reflect the *collective culture and priorities* steering the effort from a personal and professional viewpoint translated to the strategic planning process. The guiding principles were formulated by the California emergency management and homeland security community during the strategic planning and goal setting process. The principles reflect *procedural priorities, shared processes, and rules of engagement* for all developmental aspects of this effort.

Core Values

- A strong, coordinated state emergency management and homeland security system that, through our collective efforts, addresses prevention, preparedness, response, recovery and mitigation.
- A culture of interagency collaboration in pursuit of strong public health, safety and welfare programs and policies.
- Continual improvement of State capabilities to deal with pending threats to public health, safety and welfare.
- A protected and healthy citizenry of California who are the end users of all decisions made and efforts undertaken by the State's highly dedicated and capable emergency management and homeland security personnel.

Guiding Principles

- Promote open information sharing and education efforts across all agencies and departments.
- Support each agency and department's individual goals and statutory requirements as part of a 'whole system' of preparedness and planning for California's readiness.
- Leverage limited State and federal funding in a coordinated manner to pursue the State's overall needs.
- Provide the best possible coordinated emergency policy advice to the Governor before, during, and after a catastrophic situation.

Chapter 4

Background / Organization Description

Role of the GEOEC

The Governor's Emergency Operations Executive Council (GEOEC) is co-chaired by the Director of the Governor's Office of Emergency Services (OES) and the Director of the Governor's Office of Homeland Security (OHS). GEOEC convenes no less than quarterly to fulfill Provision 1 of *Executive Order S-04-06*. GEOEC's mission under the EO is to:

- a) assess and provide necessary information to the Governor, Legislature, local agencies, and the public on pending emergency conditions that threaten the public health and safety;
- b) develop a consolidated set of budget, legislative, and administrative actions, along with identification of additional federal resources required to improve state prevention and response capabilities to deal with pending threats to public health and safety; and
- c) assist in the management of emergency preparedness, response, recovery, & mitigation efforts.

GEOEC Membership

The membership of the GEOEC consists of all State agencies and departments with operational responsibilities or day-to-day involvement in emergency planning and response. Standing membership of the GEOEC is listed below. The group, however, is designed to be expanded on an as-needed basis to include directors of other departments involved in responding to a specific emergency, or on a permanent basis upon consensus of the group.

GEOEC Membership
<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Director of the Governor's Office of Emergency Services (OES), co-chair▪ Director of the Governor's Office of Homeland Security (OHS), co-chair▪ Chair of the Air Resources Board (ARB)▪ Secretary of the Business, Transportation and Housing Agency (BTH)▪ Director of the California Conservation Corps (CCC)▪ Commissioner of the California Highway Patrol (CHP)▪ Adjutant General of the California National Guard (CNG)▪ Secretary of Service & Volunteering (CaliforniaVolunteers)▪ Secretary of the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR)▪ Secretary of Education▪ Director of the Emergency Medical Services Authority (EMSA)▪ Secretary of the California Environmental Protection Agency (CalEPA)▪ Director of the California Department of Finance (DOF)▪ Director of the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG)

- Secretary of the California Department of Food and Agriculture (CDFA)
- Director of the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CalFire)
- Director of the California Department of General Services (DGS)
- Secretary of the California Health and Human Services Agency (CHHS)
- Secretary of the Labor and Workforce Development Agency (LWDA)
- Director of the Department of Personnel Administration (DPA)
- Director of the California Department of Public Health (CDPH)
- Director of the California Department of Rehabilitation (DOR)
- Secretary of the Resources Agency
- Secretary of the State and Consumer Services Agency (SCSA)
- Director of the California Department of Social Services (CDSS)
- State Chief Information Officer
- State Fire Marshal
- State Veterinarian
- Director of the California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC)
- Director of the California Department of Transportation (CalTrans)
- Secretary of the California Department of Veterans Affairs (CDVA)
- Director of the California Department of Water Resources (DWR)

Relationship to Other Committees/Councils

The GEOEC advises the Governor, the cabinet, and the Director of the Office of Emergency Services on the planning and coordination of State resources for emergency preparedness. Accordingly, the GEOEC is comprised of the agency secretaries and directors of departments that are the core of most emergency preparation and management efforts. The Council is supplemented as needed for special or unusual events by other agencies.

The California Emergency Council (CEC) is the official advisory body to the Governor on all matters pertaining to statewide emergency preparedness, response, recovery and mitigation efforts. Established by the Emergency Services Act (Section 8575), the CEC also acts as an advisory body to the Governor in times of emergency. The CEC provides assistance to the Governor for all emergency situations that occur in California.

There are numerous other key work groups that provide input to the GEOEC. These groups provide subject matter expertise and focus on individual areas of emergency preparedness. This guidance is then incorporated into the overarching State coordination efforts of the GEOEC. Committees include, but are not limited to: the SEMS Advisory Board, State Emergency Response Commission (SERC), CDHHS' Joint Advisory Committee (JAC), and the Private/Non-Governmental Organizations Working Group (in E.O. S-04-06).

GEOEC has a two-way relationship with these other subject-specific committees. It takes the subject matter expert information and recommendations of these subject-specific committees and incorporates it into its enterprise-wide planning and coordination efforts. It does not, however, substitute its judgement for the subject matter specific committees, or duplicate their work.

Charter & Operations

The Organizational Charter (Charter) was officially adopted by the members of the GEOEC in July 2006 and is continually updated to reflect new members and organizational changes. The Charter outlines the roles, responsibilities, guiding principles, future goals, permanent members and general operation of the GEOEC.

As identified in the Charter, the GEOEC created a Senior Staff Working Group (SSWG) to provide needed analytical, logistical, policy and program support to assist the GEOEC executives to accomplish full committee goals and objectives. SSWG representatives are identified by each GEOEC member to represent them at SSWG meetings. SSWG meetings typically occur two weeks prior to a GEOEC meeting, but additional meetings are scheduled when it is needed.

The SSWG develops a *GEOEC Work Plan* to identify processes, products and projected timeframes to be addressed during the year. It identifies four categories to be addressed by the GEOEC, including budget, legislation, GEOEC's role in an emergency, and the development of a State strategy. Consequently, four smaller work teams have been created to complete the specific tasks identified in the *GEOEC Work Plan*.

Work Teams

1. Budget Work Team – Develop and coordinate the Annual Budget Change Proposal (BCP) process
2. Legislative Work Team – Develop and coordinate Annual Legislative process.
3. Multi-Agency Emergency Policy Advisory Team (MEPAT) – Advise GEOEC on the role of the GEOEC relative to an emergency.
4. State Strategy Work Team – Develop and refine the *State Strategy for Emergency Management and Homeland Security*.

Chapter 5

Strategic Focus Areas

The strategic focus areas identified in this chapter reflect the key near-term direction for the GEOEC organization as a whole. While these elements are primarily geared to State agencies and departments, their implementation will certainly impact interaction with and activities of the state's emergency management and homeland security partners. These strategic focus areas are considered critical to the viability and effectiveness of California's emergency management and homeland security programs.

Leadership

Cultivate recognition and support of the importance and priority of emergency management and homeland security within the context of the Administration's goals and each state agency's mission and strategic planning.

Capacity & Sustainability

Propose baseline staffing and resources required to coordinate and oversee the development, implementation, and sustainment of all segments of state agencies' emergency management and homeland security programs, including prevention, preparedness, response, recovery, and mitigation.

Planning

Ensure foundational emergency management and homeland security policies and documents are consistent with current national and state guidance while also ensuring appropriate and coordinated alignment for response and recovery activity.

Communication & Collaboration

Develop integrated and ongoing systems which emphasize both cross-organizational and internal information sharing and program development. Seek advice and input from external stakeholders who are affected by and can contribute to the success of this strategic plan.

Chapter 6

Enterprise-Wide Issues

The GEOEC has identified key focus areas that involve the efforts of multiple State agencies and departments. These enterprise-wide issues are key to the State's mission to enhance California's emergency preparedness. Yet, these focus areas cannot be the responsibility of one single entity. Instead, these issues require coordination among all or the majority of all state agencies and departments. The GEOEC *State Strategy* focuses on these issues to identify a process for coordination and to outline goals and objectives to enhance the State's preparation and response in these areas. This list is intended to be fluid and will be revised and updated each year as new enterprise-wide issues arise.

Thirteen key enterprise-wide issues have been identified by the GEOEC as requiring coordination and collaboration across all state agencies, including:

1. Funding Issues & Coordination
2. Continuity of Operations / Continuity of Government (COOP/COG)
3. Emergency Management
4. Community Readiness
5. Information Sharing
6. Interoperable Communications
7. Legislative Coordination
8. Pandemic Planning
9. Training & Exercises
10. Workforce Issues
11. Capabilities Identification and Assessment
12. Cyber Systems, Technology and Security Coordination
13. Coordination with Local, Regional and Federal Plans & Programs

Funding Issues & Coordination

Brief Summary of Issue and Efforts to Coordinate:

Leveraging and coordinating funding across agencies and departments is key to the State's emergency preparedness program. Executive Order S-04-06 directed State GEOEC agencies to develop an annual process for coordinating and identifying funding sources for the State's emergency preparedness efforts. This includes developing and refining a GEOEC facilitated annual budget change proposal (BCP) process; identifying and coordinating available federal emergency preparedness funds, including supporting the homeland security investment justification process; and standardizing the process for requesting and securing and post disaster funding. The Senior Staff Working Group (SSWG) established the Budget Work subcommittee to coordinate budget requests and link budget requests to the State's priorities.

1. Budget Coordination:

Budget coordination has been a challenge across State government for two primary reasons:

1. The General Fund has limited available funding for many needs, which is especially true for the current fiscal environment. Special funded departments can somewhat rely on fees to fund critical needs, however General Fund departments must rely on limited federal funding or other non-General Fund sources to build critical infrastructure. In addition, most of those sources are not considered permanent base-line funds. Permanent base-line funds must be consistently available to build the needed response mechanisms. The identification of a permanent base-line fund source is critical. Lack of a viable consistent, ongoing source of funding severely hampers the department's ability to develop and maintain emergency response capabilities.
2. The lack of a guiding document (e.g., the Gap Analysis and Metrics Project) has hampered the ability of the GEOEC to prioritize budget requests. The SSWG, through a consensus based process, has developed a prioritization tool that the GEOEC has used to provide the administration with prioritized budget requests. This process should continue to be refined until the Gap Analysis and results of the Metrics Project can be used as the guide.

2. Homeland Security Grant Funding

California began receiving federal homeland security funds starting in federal fiscal year 2001. In partnership with federal, State and local public safety agencies, a strategy for planning the use of these funds was developed that was designed to promote multi-discipline and regional cooperation. This process is designed to build capabilities that are part of a well-planned, integrated State preparedness system. Since 2001, California has used this process to utilize over \$1.3 billion received in federal funds to build enhanced preparedness capabilities in every part of the State.

Each year, the State of California applies for federal grants through the U.S. Department of Homeland Security to fund homeland security preparedness programs and projects throughout the State. State allocations for federal homeland security grant programs, including the State Homeland Security Grant Program (SHSGP), the Urban Area Security Initiative (UASI) Grant Program, and the Law Enforcement Terrorism Prevention Program (LETPP), are based upon risk, need and a competitive application process. The competitive portion of the application is based on the development of a statewide Enhancement Plan and Investment Justifications from the State as well as from each of six federally designated high-risk urban areas to determine present capabilities, identify areas that are strengths and weaknesses, and identify how funds could be used to fill gaps in preparedness efforts.

To prepare for the application process, OHS conducts an Investment Justification Workshop in December of each year. Hundreds of first responders, State and local partners attend the workshop to determine the capabilities of the State and local jurisdictions to prevent, protect, respond to and recover from a catastrophic event. Based upon this workshop, OHS, in collaboration with other State agencies, develop a State Preparedness Report (SPR) and investment justifications on behalf of the State and our local partners. The SPR and investment justification plans are reviewed by US-DHS to determine allocations of federal preparedness grants. These plans will also guide additional homeland security investments throughout the State.

3. Post Disaster Funding

The legislature created the Disaster Response Emergency Operations Account (DREOA) in 1985, as a component of the Special Fund for Economic Uncertainties, specifically to provide funding for disaster operations undertaken by state departments in response to a state of emergency proclaimed by the Governor. Currently, reimbursement is limited to those activities that occur within 120 days of the date of a Governor's proclamation, although such time restrictions have not always been present.

The intent behind the creation of the DREOA was that the account would function similarly to the emergency fund used by CalFire to fund extended firefighting operations. Many departments participate in extended disaster operations without knowing how or when they will receive reimbursement, or, more specifically, how to access funds from the DREOA. To meet immediate needs, departments redirect existing resources, while awaiting reimbursement from the State or the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) when there is a federal emergency or major disaster declaration.

After disaster strikes, departments typically work with their individual DOF Budget Analysts to determine how to obtain state funding for disaster operations. The timing of reimbursement is not well understood by the affected departments. There are no published guidelines or instructions detailing eligibility criteria or procedures for the DREOA, and, therefore, the system lacks formal definition and consistency. Given the frequency and size of disaster events in the State and the criticality of certain functions, departments should have a predictable, well-defined, and documented mechanism for accessing funding to support disaster response operations.

Goals for Future Coordination:

Budget Coordination:

1. Continue to refine the budget process.
2. Identify dedicated funding sources that are permanent and flexible enough to allow for an enterprise wide emergency response system.

Homeland Security Grant Funding

3. Continuously reassess and re-evaluate the State's investment justifications to ensure that funding prioritization is up to date.
4. Ensure participation of all stakeholders to capture complete application information.
5. Develop and implement a project/program assessment tool to ensure enhancements are being made systematically and strategically.

Post Disaster Funding

6. Recommend DOF work with OES to create a uniform and consistent process, with written eligibility guidelines and procedures, for accessing funding from the DREOA and via the Deficiency process using Supplemental Appropriation Bills or Item 9840 of the annual Budget Act.
7. To keep departments better informed after a large disaster, recommend DOF issue a Budget Letter to address funding issues specific to that disaster, points of contact for information coordination, timelines, procedures for coordinating with DOF and OES when dealing with FEMA public assistance claims, and any other information that will facilitate the expeditious processing of reimbursement for disaster operations.

Continuity of Operation/Continuity of Government

Brief Summary of Issue:

All agencies and departments having important roles in emergency management, homeland security and the governance of the State must maintain critical functions. Interruptions due to disasters, power outages or other events may be inevitable, but it is the responsibility of the key agencies to return to normal operations and provide governance leadership as quickly as possible. Downtown Sacramento, the location of headquarters for many agencies and departments, is vulnerable to flooding, power outages, urban fire, earthquakes, various types of terrorist attacks and transportation accidents. Similar concentrations of State governmental activity exist in other parts of the State and also must address continuity of operations and governance.

In the summer of 2006, the Governor recognized the importance of continuity of operation and continuity of government (COOP/COG) in Executive Order S-04-06 and directed the agencies and departments in the Executive Branch to update or prepare COOP/COG plans. By the end of September, eighty-four plans were updated and submitted to OES.

The Governor also directed OES to identify the agencies key to the governance and protection of the State, to review their plans, and to develop a COOP/COG plan for the Executive Branch. In December 2006, OES circulated a draft Executive Branch COOP/COG plan to the GEOEC. In May 2007 the plan was sent to the Governor's Office.

In addition to COOP/COG plans, agencies and departments are required by regulations in the State Administrative Manual to develop and keep current Operational Recovery Plans for their computer and communications systems. These plans must be submitted annually to the California Office of Information Security & Privacy Protection (OISPP), within the State & Consumer Services Agency.

Efforts to Coordinate:

In 2006 OES provided guidance for the development and update of COOP/COG plans. However OES only ensured that the plans addressed all topics. There was no review for adequacy and no review to ensure the plans were coordinated. OES and OISPP have a work group to better coordinate COOP/COG and ORP efforts.

Areas that should be Coordinated:

1. Relocation destinations and logistics to relocate
2. Communications
3. Allocation of resources
4. Command and control
5. Operational Recovery Plans
6. Training

7. Exercises

Goals for Future Coordination:

1. Establish that COOP/COG planning and plan implementation are a high priority for agency interest and resource allocation.
2. Establish a plan review and coordination process (possible regulations in SAM).
3. Establish a process for identifying resource needs and prioritizing and requesting resources.
4. Establish and implement a coordinated Exercise program that results in continual improvement of the capabilities of the key agencies.
5. Coordination with the COOP/COG efforts of the constitutional offices and legislature.
6. Coordination between OES and OISPP relative to the Operational Recovery Plan alignment with the more recent COOP/COG initiatives.

Emergency Management

Brief Summary of Issue: State agencies and departments are cornerstones of the State Emergency Plan and the Standardized Emergency Management System. Governor Pete Wilson recognized the importance of the role of the State agencies and issued Executive Order W-9-91 requiring each agency and department adopt Administrative Orders identifying their roles in emergencies and disasters. The State Emergency Plan identifies the roles of key agencies in emergency management based on the Administrative Orders and relates those roles to the Federal Emergency Support Functions (ESF). All agencies have adopted Administrative Orders, however there is no process to ensure that the individual orders are up to date, reflect current and anticipated needs, ensure that agencies have up-to-date implementation plans and that the agencies will have the resources for implementation.

Governor Schwarzenegger issued EXECUTIVE ORDER S-04-06. This EO set forth the following:

- Established the GEOEC;
- Established the Emergency Partnership Advisory Workgroup to include non governmental organizations in emergency preparedness;
- Required state agencies to update their COOP/COG plans;
- Established the "Be Smart, Be Prepared, Be Responsible" public awareness campaign to ensure that all individuals, families and schools have the information needed to prepare themselves until assistance can arrive during and following a disaster;
- Required the Secretary of Health and Human Services to convene a working group of representatives from hospitals and health care organizations to ensure local health facility surge capacity plans achieve federal Health Resources and Services Administration surge capacity benchmarks, and participate in conducting exercises and training to prepare for natural and man-made disasters;
- Required the office of what is now called CaliforniaVolunteers, in cooperation with the Health and Human Services Agency, the Office of Emergency Services, the Office of Homeland Security, and non-profit volunteer organizations, to ensure the coordination of volunteer activities related to disaster response and recovery, including necessary training, equipment, and transportation provisions.

Further, with Governor Schwarzenegger requiring that the agencies and departments improve their situational awareness and anticipation of needed resources during emergencies and disasters, state agencies are charged to improve the coordination of Emergency Operation Centers (EOCs), Geospatial Information System (GIS) operations, field intelligence, communications, resource acquisition and distribution, volunteers, and donations. The challenge is that most agencies do not have the staffing or the expertise in emergency management to make and maintain these necessary improvements.

Efforts to Coordinate: EO S-04-06 established a number of venues for coordination. All are currently active.

Departments and agencies are also called upon to participate in a number of different forums to improve the emergency management in the state, many of them are in support of the maintenance of the Standardized Emergency Management System (SEMS); others include the Statewide Emergency Strategic Plan, SEMS Specialist Committee, the Catastrophic Plan Work Group, and the Statewide Hazard Mitigation Plan work group.

Further, during significant events, State agency efforts are coordinated through the OES Regional and State Operational Centers or by pre-agreements. The specific recommendations to improve coordination are identified in After Action Reports generated by OES with the input from state and local agencies. Though a requirement exists in the National Incident Management System (NIMS) to establish and implement Corrective Actions, there has not been a consistent effort to consider and implement corrective actions.

Goals for Future Coordination:

1. Develop and maintain a process to keep Administrative Orders aligned with the current State Emergency Plan and coordinated among the GEOEC Agencies.
2. Commit to utilizing the After Action/Corrective Action Process
3. Develop and maintain a process to determine the overall quality of the state agencies' emergency preparedness, response, recovery and mitigation performance and an additional process for gauging the performance of the Executive Branch as a whole.
4. Develop and maintain the capability, including staffing and resources, to adequately prepare for and respond to emergencies and disasters.
5. Ensure that exercises and training are based on the State Emergency Plan and the emergency plans of the agencies and departments.
6. Successfully utilize the workgroups called for by EO S-04-06.
7. Maximize the coordination of the State's purchasing power before disasters occur.

Community Readiness

Brief Summary of Issues:

Community readiness is marked by awareness among the population of the risks and readiness actions that can be taken to minimize loss and damages following an event. It is essential that the State bring about greater and sufficient collaboration and coordination among government agencies, non-governmental organizations, business, community groups, disability service organizations, academic institutions, households, and others, to improve readiness, reduce disaster-related losses, and expedite recovery from all hazards in the State.

Efforts to Coordinate:

In keeping with the national homeland security priorities, Citizen Preparedness and Participation continues to be identified as a priority in the state's *Homeland Security Strategy*. All state agencies have an interest and a stake in promoting community readiness, which extends from the individual to the larger community and to the State as a whole.

Of the state agency strategic plans reviewed, the goal of community readiness focused primarily on those activities to prepare their own agency either to withstand emergency events or prepare to respond. Efforts to date have emphasized state agencies' internal operations and individual employee preparedness efforts. There are few state agencies that have adopted a targeted readiness campaign for their constituents. For example, the California Department of Public Health and Emergency Medical Services Authority work to increase the capacity of local health providers and promote good public health awareness and practices. In addition, the Governor's Office of Emergency Services, in partnership with CaliforniaVolunteers, initiated the First Lady's "Be Ready" campaign. The Governor's Office of Homeland Security funds community readiness activities through its administration of various federal homeland security grant programs.

Goals for Future Coordination:

CaliforniaVolunteers has taken a lead role in promoting the state's readiness efforts by drawing together partners from more than 30 state, local, and non-profit entities to create a single strategic plan to guide their efforts. The *California Community Readiness Plan for Disaster, 2008-2010* has three goals:

1. To increase public awareness and actions to reduce personal losses and increase readiness in California.
2. To build capacity among California communities to respond during a disaster.

3. To increase interagency coordination among public and private entities in California that serve vulnerable populations during a disaster event.

The Plan will build upon the strengths of the previous First Lady's campaign and also embraces a research element for future efforts.

Implementation of the *Plan* is being managed by an Executive Council comprised of CaliforniaVolunteers, the Governor's Office of Emergency Services, the Governor's Office of Homeland Security, the Seismic Safety Commission, and the First Lady's Office. Work groups for each goal have been established to ensure coordination. This *Plan* is a call-to-action for all California-based entities and state agencies that support disaster readiness. State agencies are encouraged to review the plan and identify opportunities for investment that they can address.

Information Sharing

Brief Summary of Issue & Efforts to Coordinate:

Information sharing is at the heart of emergency planning and response. Strengthening information sharing and collaboration capabilities (across State government and the public at-large) is a priority for the State. Information sharing covers several areas, including Homeland Security, Geospatial Information Systems (GIS), external communications and emergency management.

To ensure that emergency management and homeland security departmental activities and programs are coordinated and effective, State agencies and departments must have the ability to rapidly move information between and among public and private agencies and entities, internal staff, and more importantly with the public at-large. Not all information can or should be shared, but the ability to effectively direct emergency planning and response information to critical partners will be severely challenged and tested if the right information does not get to its intended audience in time to have a positive impact. Agencies and departments, through their Information Security Officers, should become more proactive in managing cyber events and threats through training and appropriate information sharing.

Most State agencies and departments are in the early phase of drafting information sharing plans and strategies. The exception being those State entities whose statutory mission is emergency preparedness, response, recovery and mitigation, either as lead or support in coordination with OES.

Agency and department strategic plans differ in their definition of, and approach to information sharing. A common definition of 'Information Sharing' must be developed. If we are addressing 'High-level Information Sharing' - it would be helpful to define the parameters of what we intend to measure. Agencies and departments need to define the audience impacted by their information sharing: For example: (a) Internal Staff; (b) Agency-to-Agency (including local, state and/or federal as appropriate); (c) Agency- to- Stakeholders – (including the public).

Sound risk assessment, coordination and cooperation among agencies in emergencies, relies on knowledge of each partners response to emergencies. Having knowledge of the mission, capacity and emergency plans of State partners through the sharing of information will enhance the timely delivery of mutual aid and assistance.

Examples of information sharing strategies that agencies and departments are developing or enhancing in support of their Administrative Orders are:

Information Sharing for Homeland Security

- Specify information sharing objectives – including areas for coordination with other local (including community-based organizations), State, and/or federal agencies;

- Strengthen joint State and Federal Joint Information Center (JIC) collaboration;
- Increase coordination and information sharing with US Department of Homeland Security (USDHS) through exchange of analysts in California and Washington, D.C.;
- Increase coordination and information analysis efforts through regional partnerships with the FBI; and,
- Continue collaboration on cyber information sharing among the COISAPP and the Multi-State Information Sharing and Analysis Center, the United States Computer Emergency Readiness Team (US-CERT), USDHS, the RTTACs, the Federal Bureau of Investigation's Infragard, and the California Highway Patrol's Computer Crimes Investigation Unit.

Information Sharing for Emergency Management

- Develop and implement measurable strategic plan objectives and strategies (action plans) to effectively implement Agency Administrative Orders. (All COOP/COG-related state administrative directives require effective and efficient information sharing plans and strategies.);
- Collaborate with COOP/COG committee to develop an emergency external communication plan to include a cadre of spokespeople for emergencies;
- Specify within Strategic Plans, information sharing related to what each State agency and department will do during a disaster or emergency. Documentation should include a description of how State agencies and departments, federal and local agencies function together in a coordinated escalating emergency response;
- Ensure Departmental Operations Centers (DOC) are California's Standardized Emergency Management System (SEMS) compliant in providing centralized oversight, command, and control in dealing with potential incidents and hazard scenarios. SEMS mirrors the federal National Incident Management System (NIMS), and ensures the setting of priorities, interagency cooperation, the efficient flow of resources and the management of public information;
- Provide stakeholders/partners with strategic plan implementation and training (e.g. table top exercises);
- Enhance and expand the Terrorism Liaison Officer (TLO) program to more law enforcement, public safety and state agencies to provide greater awareness, reporting, and enhance information sharing; and
- Maintain and share regulatory review agency information with stakeholders.

Information Sharing with the Public

Governor Schwarzenegger has stated: “The ability of local and State agencies to provide timely and accurate information to the public about threats and safety instructions before, during and immediately after emergencies is a top priority of my administration.” California’s information sharing strategies and goals for future coordination include the following:

- Develop and strengthen partnerships with key government, nonprofit, and faith-based organizations to develop their emergency response and recovery capabilities;
- Focus on public safety partnerships to enhance information sharing and threat assessment analysis, including the addition of four Regional Terrorism Threat Assessment Centers (RTTACs) and the State Terrorism Threat Assessment Center (STTAC) to provide information sharing and threat assessment information throughout the public safety community – at the federal, State and local level;
- Work with local Community Emergency Incident Response Teams. Where unavailable, work with State OES and Counties to establish local teams;
- Work with counties to enhance telephone emergency notification systems (“reverse 9-1-1” system). Governor Schwarzenegger has set aside approximately \$2 million from the State’s share of fiscal year 2007 Federal Department of Homeland Security grant funds for counties without these systems to purchase and install them; and
- Continue working on assessing information needs and finding grant sources to satisfy those needs.

Goals for Future Coordination:

Homeland Security

1. Expand the use of, and improve the content of California’s Joint Regional Information Exchange System (JRIES);
2. Identify education and training needed to implement information sharing, and enhance information and sharing system and analytical tool-sets;
3. Improve coordination and connectivity between California’s information sharing and analysis centers (fusion centers);

Emergency Management

4. Place up-to-date emergency planning and response information on websites. Information can include general information, guides, checklists, and links to other emergency preparedness sites. Information can be targeted to specific audiences such as individuals with special needs and information for businesses;

5. Define the technical infrastructure necessary to exchange information and/or data between computer systems. Test systems regularly and assure security. Provide consultation and technical assistance on all communications of IT functions and specifications with stakeholders, both public and private as appropriate or desired;
6. Sharing of non-confidential information with other State agencies. Partnering agencies should possess a knowledge of all COOP/COG planning that have similar responsibilities, such as mass care and shelter), and share Administrative Orders with GEOEC highlighting resources and capabilities;
7. Enhance planning to operate the Joint Information Center (JIC), to include:
 - a. Strengthening of the State & Federal Joint Information Center (JIC) collaboration. In a large-scale disaster, state agencies join local, state and federal partners to coordinate public information through their respective Public Information Officers (PIOs). JICs may include, but are not limited to, cities, counties, special purpose districts, nonprofit organizations such as the American Red Cross, utilities and business and industry. The JIC provides a forum for the sharing of information between jurisdictions and a central point for the media to get information;
 - b. Ensuring the placement of a PIO within the Agency Incident Command Structure (ICS); and
 - c. The best time to prepare the public for potential consequences is through risk communication prior to an incident. State agencies and departments should process and recognize the information and communication linkage between levels of emergency management consistent with principles outlined in SEMS. Providing timely and accurate information about potential emergencies is critical. Agencies and departments can produce press releases and public information messages through various media well in advance of an emergency.
8. Assess policies, procedures and training to impact the assessments of Information Sharing or Emergency Management during and following an emergency incident. Assessment will include, but is not limited to:
 - a. Level of compliance with the Standard Emergency Management System (SEMS);
 - b. Assessment of the state's Joint Information System (JIS), to include critical training opportunities impacting the timely gathering, verification and dissemination of information. Assessment should include the handling of rumor control, the gathering of information across multi-agencies and multi-jurisdictions, clarifying communications and staffing operations for the Joint Information Center (JIC), and defining deliverable metrics that can be understood by all stakeholders, especially as they may impact information sharing;
 - c. Assessment of the updating of information sharing and emergency management at the JIC during and following an emergency, including field assessments from Local Incident Command Posts (ICP), and the timely dissemination of information, as warranted, with local, state and federal emergency response partners; and
 - d. Update and enhance the handling of Immediate Information Needs of partners and the public as a result of rumors and/or news reporting (e.g. CNN News). Policies, procedures

and training should address: (1) State Agency Executives' need to receive high-level information, (2) State Agency Employees' needed to report to work, and (3) providing the public with accurate and timely information.

9. Examine the State's GIS capabilities via existing State GIS coordination committees. Identify State and public GIS information needs, and develop a strategy to maximize State resources and efforts to meet these needs.

Interoperable Communications

Brief Summary of Issue and Efforts to Coordinate:

Interoperability has been defined by the federal Department of Homeland Security's SAFECOM Program as "the ability of emergency response officials to share information via voice and data signals on demand, in real time, when needed, and as authorized." This capability is critical in enabling response agencies to effectively work together in both disaster events and everyday activities. Stemming from individual need, CA agencies have developed using disparate radio systems to provide internal communications within each agency. In aims of fostering communication across these differing systems, the California Communications Act of 2002 directed the Public Safety Radio Strategic Planning Committee (PSRSPC) to develop and implement a statewide integrated public safety communications system that facilitates interoperability among State public safety departments as well as other first response agencies. Further, the PSRSPC is to coordinate the use of public safety spectrum consistent with regulations put forth by the Federal Communications Commission (FCC).

Currently, the PSRSPC consists of fourteen member agencies making up both an executive level body as well as a technical working group; these member agencies are represented in some capacity in the GEOEC. The GEOEC looks to leverage this overlap and the PSRSPC's established effort toward improving interoperability, by deferring to this group as subject matter experts on the issue of interoperability. In keeping continual communication with the PSRSPC, the GEOEC is kept aware of outcomes and initiatives put forward by the PSRSPC and is able to implement these efforts and judgments into policy decisions supported by the GEOEC. Such a collaborative effort between the two groups has successfully occurred in the FY 2008-2009 GEOEC BCP coordination process, and will continue throughout future GEOEC efforts.

Recognizing the response occurs at the local level, the PSRSPC works closely with the California Statewide Interoperability Executive Committee (CalSIEC) to help facilitate interoperability statewide. CALSIEC has been established as the governing body for local first response agencies in regards to interoperable communications following the model recommended by the FCC. For governance purposes CALSIEC has broken the state up into four regions described as planning areas: the Northern, Capitol-Bay, Central, and Southern. Made up of local representatives, these planning areas handle interoperable planning for their respective regions, and coordinate outcomes with the full CALSIEC executive body. In coordination with SAFECOM's interoperability continuum, the PSRSPC and CALSIEC have engaged in several projects and put forth initiatives in support of CA's "System of Systems" approach to developing a fully interoperable statewide communications system.

In FY 2007 under the Public Safety Interoperable Communications (PSIC) grant program, federal Department of Homeland Security (DHS) and the federal Department of Commerce (DOC) collaboratively put forth a \$1 billion grant program to improve interoperability nationwide. With investments being vetted through both the PSRSPC and CalSIEC, the approximate \$94 million awarded CA have been allocated in a manner that bolsters regional

systems while promoting the use of advanced technologies. In order to improve and promote interoperability governance, and to identify equipment gaps, as required by DHS, the creation of a Statewide Interoperability Communications Plan (SCIP) was completed in December 2007.

As a fully interoperable system is being developed, to ensure tactical interoperability, Operational Areas (OA) have been required to participate in a regional Tactical Interoperable Communications Plan (TICP) by the end of calendar year 2008. In taking advantage of the collection of interoperable data, an initiative is being put forth in 2008 to implement the Communications Asset Survey and Mapping tool (CASM statewide), thus supplying users with analysis of interoperability capabilities. Addressing the issue of technology and tactical interoperability, six command and control communications vehicles are being procured by the Office of Emergency Services (OES) to be deployed in each of the Mutual Aid Regions (MAR). All of these efforts have included collaborative input from the PSRSPC and CalSIEC.

Goals for Future Coordination:

Due to the role of the PSRSPC relative to GEOEC agencies regarding interoperability, goals for future coordination can be referenced to the 2008 PSRSPC report to the legislature. The PSRSPC has put forth the following four goals in continuing to develop interoperability:

1. Pursue a phased, renewable, and priority-based funding strategy for California's public safety communications physical infrastructure and governance.
2. Identify and attain methods to alleviate operability shortfalls within state agency communications systems which migrate toward interoperability.
3. Develop long-term, coordinated governance structure for integrated statewide public safety voice and data communication systems.
4. Commence on-going annual opportunities to exchange current information to build knowledge on the multi-faceted topic of public safety communications.

Legislative Coordination

Brief Summary of Issue and Efforts to Coordinate:

The GEOEC Legislative Committee is charged with evaluating legislative proposals related to emergency prevention, preparedness, response and recovery.

Each agency that actively participates in the GEOEC proposes legislation that directly impacts emergency management or homeland security. Because the agencies involved with emergency management or homeland security contribute to the development of both the State of California Emergency Plan, and the State of California Homeland Security Strategy, they have a collective understanding of each other's gaps, goals, and objectives - a portion of which will invariably require statutory changes. Sharing these legislative needs with members of the GEOEC Legislative Work Team (LWT) - who have a fundamental understanding of emergency prevention and response - will result in a more holistic coordinated legislative effort.

Goals for Future Consideration:

1. Encourage the Legislative Work Team chair to confer with the Governor's Office to understand general legislative guidelines.
2. Consider whether each proposal has demonstrated input from private and public stakeholders.
3. Consider options for developing alternative solutions and discuss any necessary changes to proposals – committee members should collaborate broadly with other members to form the most advantageous policy.

Pandemic Influenza Planning

Brief Summary of Issue and Efforts to Coordinate:

Worldwide pandemics of influenza occur when a novel virus emerges to which the population has little immunity. The 20th century saw three such pandemics, the most notable of which was the 1918 influenza pandemic that was responsible for 20 million deaths throughout the world. The World Health Organization (WHO) and other experts warn that the threat of a pandemic influenza is imminent and will have devastating consequences that extend beyond health and medical systems into every sector of society.

With multiple international ports of entry and frequent traffic from Asia, California might be one of the first states affected by an influenza pandemic. Conservative estimates indicate that at least 11,000 travelers from Southeast Asia arrive via direct flights each day in California. Given the magnitude of the illness and death that may result from a pandemic, California must increase its preparedness efforts now.

Unlike other disasters, pandemic influenza unfolds over days or weeks and public health is the first responder. In addition, pandemic influenza will be worldwide and mutual aid will be limited and quickly exhausted. Finally, pandemic influenza is long lasting, with several waves of disease during a projected duration of 18-24 months.

In California, it is estimated that a pandemic influenza will occur in three waves and each wave will have an 8-week attack duration. Over the duration of the pandemic, 25 percent of the population will be affected, 4.4 percent of affected persons will be admitted to hospitals and 26.6 percent of those admitted to hospitals will die.

Recognizing the significant impact of a pandemic influenza, in 2006-07, the California Department of Health Services (now the California Department of Public Health [CDPH]) provided \$16 million for local health departments to prepare for a pandemic in their jurisdiction. Additionally, the State FY2006-07 budget provided \$214 million for purchase of supplies and equipment for 21,000 alternate care beds to supplement the 73,000 licensed acute care beds now operational in hospitals; 50 million N95 respirators for protection of healthcare workers during a pandemic; 2400 ventilators; and, to the Emergency Medical Services Authority, three mobile field hospitals. These funds also provided 3.7 million courses of antivirals for treatment of a pandemic influenza. These courses are supplemented with 5.3 million courses maintained by the federal government for California for a total of 9.0 million courses, which will provide sufficient antivirals for approximately 25 percent of California's population. CDPH also conducted a project to develop standards and guidelines for healthcare providers to use in preparing for and responding to a surge in demand for healthcare. These investments in preparing for a pandemic were supported by federal funds allocated for pandemic influenza and state General Funds.

In 2006, CDPH issued the *Pandemic Influenza Preparedness and Response Plan*, which provides strategic direction for its responsibilities in a pandemic. In April 2007, in response to a directive from U.S. HHS Secretary Leavitt to Governor Schwarzenegger, CDPH submitted the California State Pandemic Influenza Operations Plan to the federal Department of Health and Human Services. This plan addresses federally-required components including preparedness plans for health; education; critical infrastructure; economy, trade and business; state workforce; safety and public security; and agriculture and food. Additionally, other state agencies have developed plans for pandemic preparedness or have adopted their Continuity of Operations/Continuity of Government plans for a pandemic. At the local level, all local health departments have developed pandemic influenza response plans.

California has conducted numerous exercises at the state and local levels in preparation for a pandemic influenza. CDPH and local health departments have conducted tabletop and functional exercises. Other state agencies have held tabletop exercises. In 2006, the Trust for America's Health, a national non-profit health organization, held a pandemic influenza symposium in Los Angeles with concurrent sessions involving leaders in health, education, community based organizations, critical infrastructure, and business discussing pandemic preparedness. In May 2007, a California delegation including state representatives from the Governor's Offices of Emergency Services and Homeland Security, CDPH, California Highway Patrol, and California Military Department participated in a regional tabletop exercise convened by the National Governor's Association.

Goals for Future Coordination:

1. Develop a Statewide Pandemic Influenza Contingency Plan. OES is developing a statewide contingency plan that will cover all State and local agencies.
2. Develop public messages and information for the public on response to a pandemic influenza, including non-pharmacologic community containment measures.
3. Recognizing that vaccine and antivirals will be in short supply, establish policies for prioritization.
4. Increase capacity at CDPH's Viral and Rickettsial Diseases Laboratory to conduct laboratory tests for pandemic influenza.
5. Conduct a functional exercise with a pandemic influenza scenario that involves healthcare providers, local, and State government.

Training and Exercises

Brief Summary of Issue:

The State of California has been a national leader in the training and exercising of first responders, emergency managers, state employees, volunteers and the private sector. Due to the frequency with which disasters and emergencies occur in this State, California has created the most robust training and exercise program in the country. However, this level must be strengthened and coordinated to ensure that institutional knowledge is maintained and training and exercises are updated to account for the evolving field. Continuous training and exercising that includes all partners in emergency management and homeland security are critical to ensuring that services are delivered effectively when crises occur.

The Governor's Office of Homeland Security Training and Exercise Division (OHOSTED) and the Governor's Office of Emergency Services (OES) Training & Exercise Branch are the primary State entities responsible for coordinating the development of training courses in emergency management, terrorism awareness, and WMD/CBRNE in California. OHOSTED and OES Training & Exercise Branch work with our State training partners including; Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training (POST), California Specialized Training Institute (CSTI), California State Fire Marshal's Office, California Firefighter Joint Apprenticeship Committee (CFFJAC) and Emergency Medical Services Authority (EMSA), among others, to develop and certify relevant terrorism prevention, response and recovery, WMD/CBRNE and emergency management training courses in the State. These training partners are utilized to evaluate all courses that are presented to California agencies with grant funds for evaluation.

OHOSTED and OES Training & Exercise Branch rely on the recommendations provided by the Emergency Response Training Advisory Committee (ERTAC). ERTAC, established in 2003 by SB 1350 (McPherson), recommends criteria for training curriculum for emergency responders and is made up of nine key members, many of which serve on the GEOEC.

OHS has developed and continually improves the Homeland Security Exercise and Evaluation Program (HSEEP) that provides an opportunity for capabilities testing, assessment, and improvement. This program features the Governor's Annual Statewide Exercise Series, Golden Guardian. The Golden Guardian Exercise Series is conducted annually to coordinate prevention, preparation, response, and recovery mechanisms of local, State, and federal entities, and private sector/volunteer organizations in the worst case scenario of three major events occurring throughout the State simultaneously. The exercise implements critical elements of the National Preparedness Guidelines, the National Response Framework (NRF), the National Incident Management System (NIMS), and Homeland Security Presidential Directives (HSPD) 5 and 8. This exercise requires the participation and coordination of numerous State agencies and departments, especially those which are members of the GEOEC. The GEOEC is kept aware of planning efforts and outcomes of the Statewide exercise.

Goals for Future Coordination:

1. Establish process to identify and catalogue training courses across State agencies and make this information available to State agencies and departments. This will allow all agencies and departments to maximize the training opportunities for their employees at the lowest cost to the State.
2. Establish process for identifying State personnel trained in Essential State Functions (ESFs).
3. Use GEOEC to assist the ERTAC in identifying new training course needs.
4. Enhance State Training Partnerships
5. Continue and expand the participation in the Governor's Annual Statewide Exercise Series, "Golden Guardian." Use the lessons learned from Golden Guardian to develop new training courses available to all State agencies and departments that need them.
6. Continue to meet national training and exercise standards.

Workforce Issues

Brief Summary of Issue and Efforts to Coordinate:

The greatest asset of the State of California is its workforce. Over 200,000 individuals make up the California State Civil Service system which is administered by the State Personnel Board and the Department of Personnel Administration. Additionally, the Governor appoints certain positions that are exempt from civil service laws. Regardless of classification, each State employee can serve an important function during and after a catastrophe.

First and critical to response and recovery is promoting programs of personal and family readiness. Raising awareness and promoting educational programs directly improves the safety and financial outcomes for individuals, families and communities and the ability for employees to return to work following a catastrophe. This directly impacts the State's ability to utilize the State workforce as disaster workers and provide enterprise support for the continuity of operations and governance.

In a catastrophic situation, the duties, functions and activities of non-emergency State workers will be dramatically altered instantly. Workforce issues that could arise include temporary reassignment of duties, relocation to alternative operating facilities, increased absenteeism, altered security procedures, sick leave/paid leave issues and payroll issues. These issues could cut across all State agencies, departments, boards and bureaus depending on the magnitude, location and duration of the disaster. Specifically, civil service classifications dictate what job duties most state employees are authorized to perform, and contain provisions allowing for specific reassignments during an emergency situation.

Efforts to coordinate these issues lie chiefly with the Department of Personnel Administration (DPA). Represented employees have guidelines that they must follow to secure "administrative time off", time off for volunteers, using leave credit, catastrophic leave banks and the conditions required to trigger eligibility.

Additionally, at the direction of the Governor's Office, state agencies were mandated to plan for a Pandemic Influenza that is expected to impact North America in the next several years. This planning process provided a good opportunity for departments and agencies to evaluate their workforce plans if up to 40% of their staff is unable to come to work. Certain issues are specific to a pandemic influenza because of the prolonged nature of this catastrophe.

Goals for Future Coordination:

Workforce issues in a catastrophe are complicated and complex, due to the nature of state civil service employment, laws and regulations. It is imperative to properly plan for these situations because the nature of a catastrophe makes it impossible to truly anticipate the characteristics of each event.

1. Develop and apply a system to inventory the skill sets of the State's workforce that enables activation and deployment of appropriate personnel to the impacted areas in an efficient manner. This would also assist DPA, SPB and other state agencies deploy human resources to support the state's essential functions.
2. Recommend that the State Personnel Board and the Department of Personnel Administration continue its process to collapse a number of the classifications in the State Civil Service program to allow better flexibility in temporarily reassigning employees to other duties during an emergency. This will be even more crucial given the succession planning issues currently facing the state.
3. Recommend that State agencies and departments adequately educate their employees about what changes they can expect during a catastrophic event. This would include educating employees on the essential functions of the operation, and also to illustrate some of the tasks/functions that the employee might be asked to complete.
4. Conduct exercises to evaluate the effectiveness of any plan.
5. Include in all duty statements that pursuant to Government Code §3101, all public employees are disaster service workers and outline the duties and requirements in the law. Also recommend a letter to all current Civil Service employees notifying them of their Disaster Service Worker status.
6. Recommend that the State Personnel Board and the Department of Personnel Administration consider creating a new classification for Business Continuity/Emergency Planner positions.

Capabilities Identification and Assessment

Brief Summary of Issue and Efforts to Coordinate:

In order to best manage and utilize the State's emergency preparedness resources, it is necessary to have a clear view of what is needed and what is currently in place. It is also necessary to have a common language for typing resources, to ensure the best possible coordination and preparedness for an emergency.

California has undertaken many efforts to achieve this goal. It is a national leader in the typing, identification and movement of resources in a coordinated manner. However, continuous improvement is an important goal to best manage these resources.

To enhance this ongoing effort, OHS and OES have initiated a resource and capabilities inventory and assessment effort known as the Metrics Project. The Metrics Project is supported by workgroups representing the major emergency response functions across our State, including many GEOEC member agencies and departments.

California continues to work closely with Federal Agencies and other States in support of the National effort to develop a common structure and nomenclature for the inventory and assessment of emergency resources and capabilities not only across California, but across the entire nation. To this end, the Metrics Project is coordinating with the FEMA's National Preparedness and Incident Resource Inventory Systems.

The purpose of the Metrics Project is to:

- Support the development of a common taxonomy and nomenclature for the description of emergency response and preparedness resources and capabilities;
- Develop a systematic method for identifying gaps in prevention, planning and emergency response capabilities by identifying existing assets and establishing target metrics for them, in order to more effectively allocate economic and human resources in support of achieving preparedness goals; and,
- Enhance the ability to effectively prepare for and respond to disasters by integrating a common format and repository for data regarding the quantity, quality, and location of key resources.

The GEOEC receives frequent updates on the progression of the Metrics Project. Capability gaps identified by the Metrics Project will help guide the GEOEC during the annual BCP coordination and prioritization process.

Goals for Future Coordination:

1. Confirmation of Typing: outreach across the State will be done by the existing workgroups so as to incorporate as many relevant perspectives into the typing project as possible.

Resource typing standardization functions best when as many agencies as possible are involved. To that end, existing regional and local resource management projects will be integrated to the Metrics Project whenever feasible.

2. Data Gathering: Outreach across the State, organized by the workgroups, will introduce the effort to inventory typed resources and capabilities.
3. Application: Initial rollout and beta testing of the resource management software application and development of initial reporting structures will be coordinated through the workgroups.
4. Determination of a Baseline: After standardized typing definitions have been agreed upon and current capabilities data has been gathered using this typing, a baseline metric, using the basic categories outlined above, will be established to provide a point of reference for local, regional and statewide efforts to assess current preparedness, identify gaps, prioritize future needs and coordinate support allocations.
5. Determination of Application Delivery/Hosting Model: Using the information gathering efforts as a guide, the determination will be made as to the hosting model best suited for the sustained support and maintenance of the application. Appropriate levels of security and access will be assigned, and policy and procedures developed and agreed upon by the workgroups.
6. Integration of Feedback: Lessons learned will be incorporated into typing considerations, database updates and the development of best practices. A process will be developed to support the database and typing efforts beyond the scope of the Metrics Project to continuously update the database and reevaluate the criteria for typing and metrics established.

Cyber Systems, Technology and Security Coordination

Brief Summary of Issue and Efforts to Coordinate:

Every State agency and department utilizes cyber technology to collect and share information. The coordination of these resources and the use of these tools as a resource for emergency services and homeland security is vital to the success of these efforts.

The California Office of Information Security and Privacy Protection (OISPP) is the primary state government authority in ensuring the confidentiality, integrity, and availability of State systems and applications, and ensuring the protection of State information. OISPP has responsibility and authority over statewide information security and privacy policies and standards applicable to all State government agencies, as outlined in Government Code Section 11549, Chapter 183, of the Statutes of 2007 (Senate Bill 90).

To assist State agencies and departments strengthen and/or implement their information security programs, OISPP establishes direction for information risk management through policy and procedures, including both information security and operational recovery. OISPP promotes and improves prevention and risk reduction through education, awareness, collaboration, and consultation, and ensures that incident handling, response, and follow-up occur in an effective and coordinated manner. Further, OISPP is currently engaged with the federal government, counties, cities and the higher education sector to improve the interoperability, inter-communication and strengthening training and exercise components.

Each State agency must have in place an effective risk management and information security program to ensure their information assets are properly protected. There is no easy solution to implementing an effective information security program. But, there are steps an agency can take to minimize the impact and ensure the program is implemented to fit the agency's business needs and align properly with its mission, goals and objective and still be compliant with State policy and applicable laws, regulations and statutes.

For the State's critical infrastructure and institutions, cyber technology is the control system. It is also critical to State's economy and security. Securing the State's information systems is a difficult strategic challenge that requires coordinated and focused effort from State agencies and departments, local entities and the private sector. A risk assessment of California's cyber threats reveal that a cyber event could trigger a physical disaster, such as an incident including hackers breaking into a Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition (SCADA) system or a nuclear plant operations system, causing a major physical catastrophe.

Goals for Future Coordination:

1. Establish a process for streamlining and coordinating State agency information programs and plans.
2. Identify and jointly review current mitigation and prevention efforts and best practices to improve information security programs across State government.

3. Train and exercise State agencies and departments in the prevention, preparation, response and recovery to cyber terrorism.
4. Recommend agencies and departments to have a cyber incident response plan in place before an incident occurs.

Coordination with Local, Regional, and Federal Plans & Programs

Brief Summary of Issue and Efforts to Coordinate:

Emergency planning, preparedness and operations are greatly influenced by federal policies and funding priorities. The implementation of the federal Urban Area Security Initiative (UASI) put an emphasis on the direct relationship of the federal Department of Homeland Security (USDHS) with local government in urban areas. UASI funding has allowed local agencies to take the initiative to develop regional plans and arrangements outside of any State directives.

Federal programs after the 9/11 event emphasized security; after Hurricane Katrina, the focus turned to emergency response to catastrophic events. These federal priorities have motivated the state to create organizations (OHS), modify the Standardized Emergency Management System (SEMS), and enhance the State Emergency Plan.

However the federal priorities may or may not meet the needs of California and the membership of GEOEC. Local actions may or may not include consideration of State priorities. In coordinating future efforts, GEOEC must factor in the influence of federal policy shifts as well as the plans and capabilities of local agencies.

OHS hosts a conference that include State and local agency representatives to help identify and define the Investment Justifications for the use of federal funds distributed by USDHS. Efforts to coordinate with local and regional planning and exercises are ad hoc and at the request of the sponsoring local or regional agency.

Goals for Future Coordination:

1. Work in a coordinated and collaborative fashion to review new federal policies and programs.
2. Identify, track and jointly review local and regional efforts to ensure that State agency support is coordinated.
3. Initiate coordinated outreach to local government to improve how State resources can be used earlier and more effectively.

Chapter 7

Next Steps & Closing Comments

The Governor's Emergency Operations Executive Council (GEOEC) has undertaken an important step toward enhancing California's statewide coordination in emergency management and homeland security. The development of the *State Strategy for Emergency Management and Homeland Security* is the first time State agencies and departments have come together to integrate respective strategies and plans in a single document and agree on a process to improve coordination statewide.

Each year, the *State Strategy* will be vetted through the GEOEC process to ensure it incorporates new and updated strategies and plans developed in the State, includes emerging enterprise-wide issues and opportunities for collaboration, and takes into account results from other statewide efforts to identify gaps in preparedness including the Metrics Project and the Gap Analysis. Additionally, the *State Strategy* will expand its scope to include other emergency management and homeland security issues that could benefit from enterprise-wide attention and coordination. The *State Strategy* will be refined and updated each year by the GEOEC to reflect California's evolving approach to preventing, preparing for, responding to, and recovering from natural and manmade disasters.

Since 1953, California has responded to 73 presidentially declared major disasters. California's level of catastrophe activity is further illustrated with the declaration of 1,200 States of Emergency between 1950 and 2006, impacting every county in the State. As the State continues to grow and expand, and as new challenges in disaster preparedness emerge, we must continue to prove and improve our abilities to successfully respond to catastrophes. This statewide strategic plan provides the road map to take us there.